

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 28, 2007, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 23, 24, 26, 28 and 29 for various informalities, rejected claims 9, 11, 14, 23, 24 and 26 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, provisionally rejected claims 1-29 under 35 USC 101 as claiming the same invention as co-pending application 10/791,143, rejected claims 1-11, 14-26, and 29 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Czeiger in US Patent 6,985,490, and rejected claims 12-13, and 27-28 under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Czeiger and Blumenau. In response thereto, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 29 and cancelled claims 3, 4, and 19. Claims 1, 2, 5-18, and 20-29 remain at issue.

Claim Objections

The Applicants have amended the claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 23, 24, 26, 28 and 29 to address the objections to the claims as noted by the Examiner. With regard to claim 9, the Applicants would like to point out the claim is now dependent on claim 2, which recites first and second Virtual Storage Area Networks (VSANs). The term “VSAN” in claim 9 now has the proper antecedent basis. The Applicant requests that these objections now be withdrawn.

35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

With regard to 35 USC 112 claim rejections, the Applicants have made the appropriate amendments to the claims. It is requested that these rejections now be withdrawn.

Double Patenting

The 10/791,143 application, which is assigned to the same assignee of the present application, has been expressly abandoned. A copy of the express abandonment is attached. The Applicants submit that the grounds for the double patenting rejection are no longer present and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Art Rejection

The Examiner has rejected certain claims as anticipated by Czeiger. The Applicants strongly disagree. The reference fails to teach or even suggest the claims as amended.

Certain claims of the present application have been amended to include a Border Switch that is part of both the first fabric and the second fabric. The Border Switch is configured to inject frames of information between the first fabric and the second fabric to enable a first set of end devices in the first fabric and a second set of end devices in the second fabric to

communicate with one another. A review of the Czeiger reference demonstrates that the reference fails to teach anything that resembles a Border Switch that straddles two separate fabrics and which facilitates communication between end devices in the two fabrics.

Figure 2 of Czeiger shows two Fibre Channel Storage Area Networks or “SAN A” 22 and “SAN B” 42. The SAN A 22 includes a plurality of clients 24, switches 27, and a “gateway” 26. As described in column 6 lines 1-5, the gateway 26 is a “FC switch of SAN A”. SAN B also includes a plurality of clients 44, switches 45, and a gateway 46. As described in column 6 lines 40-45, the gateway 46 also operates as a FC switch. The Applicants note that Figure 2 of Czeigler appears to include an error. It is believed that the element labeled “96” in the figure is the gateway 46 of SAN B as referred to in the written description.

The two gateways or switches 26 and 46 are connected to each other by a coupling 54. In various embodiments of Czeiger, the coupling 54 is either a fiber optic or electronic connection using a communication protocol, such as Ethernet, SONET, ATM, or SDH, to allow the two gateways 26 and 46 to communicate with one another. See column 6 lines 50-60.

As is clearly evident in Figure 2 of Czeiger, the two switches that make up the gateways or switches 26 and 46 reside entirely within their respective SANs A and B respectively. The switch of gateway 26 is not part of the SAN B, and the switch of gateway 46 is not part of the SAN B, or vice-versa. Rather the two switches reside only in their respective SAN and are connected by a coupling 54, such as a fiber optic or electronic connection.

Czeigler therefore fails to teach a Border switch that is part of two separate Fabrics or SANs. Since the reference fails to teach this feature, the claims of the present application are allowable.

Applicant believes that all pending claims have been amended and the case is now in a condition for allowance. The applicants respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER & WEAVER, LLP

/James W. Rose/
James W. Rose
Reg. No. 34,239

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001